REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Claims 1-10 and 12-22 have been amended for clarification purposes and are supported by, for example, page 2, line 24. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Patent Office objected to the abstract of the disclosure. In response, applicant submits an amended abstract. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The drawings (or amendment) were objected to because the drawings included part numbers 216-218 of Figure 2 and part number 309 of Figure 3 but were not mentioned in the specification and the drawings lack part numbers 200 and 225 in Figure 2 but were described in the specification. In response, applicant has made the following changes on page 10 of the specification: on line 1, the reference designator "200" has been deleted; at the end of line 17, the reference "211-215" has been amended to read "211-218"; and on line 18, the reference "221-225" has been amended to read "221-224"; and on page 12, line 8, the passage "a keyboard 307 and a display 306" has been amended to read " a keyboard 307, and a display 306, and/or other input/output elements 309 for inputting and presenting information ". It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added as support may be found in the originally filed drawings.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-8, 12-20, and 22 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Alam, U.S. Patent No. 6,324,544, in view of Champagne, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2005/0086199.

Alam (US 6324544) discloses a solution in which data can be synchronized between a first computing device and a second computing device in such a way that undesired duplicate data can be avoided, e.g., in a situation in which a file is renamed on the first (or second) computing device. This is based on determining whether a file (or like) already exists in a computing device under a different name after adding said file into said computing device and deleting the file with the different name if it existed.

Champagne (US 2005/0086199) discloses a solution for transferring records between databases that may have different organizations of data in records of databases. The organization of data in records is expressed with a quantity expressing the number of data fields in a record and with information characterizing the data fields. A data field is characterised with "category" information that defines a type of information the field is meant to contain (e.g. a name of a

person, an address, etc) and with "property" information that defines a format of data contained by the field (e.g. number of bits, integer, text, etc). In the solution disclosed by Champagne, a field map is established by correlating a plurality of data fields of a first database to a plurality of data fields of a second database using the above-mentioned information. Data synchronization between the first and the second database is performed using the field map.

A person of ordinary skill in the art in combining teachings of Alam and Champagne would arrive at a solution in which: data can be synchronized between a database of a first computing device and a database of a second computing device, where the first computing device may have a different organization of data in records of its database than the second computing device (Champagne), and undesired duplicate data can be avoided e.g. in a situation in which a file is renamed on the first (or second) computing device (Alam).

This is a totally different solution from the subject matter recited in the independent claims of the present application. In the solution recited in the independent claims, a grouping identifier associated with a data item is used for grouping different data items to groups (e.g. a group for data items dealing with hobby, a group for data items dealing with work, a group for data items dealing with free time, a group for data items dealing with stock market, etc).

Therefore, the cited prior art publications do not as a combination or separately teach the subject matter recited in the independent claims: "said grouping identifier being associable to at least one other data item for grouping said data items".

The Patent Office alleges on page 5 in the Office Action: "the formed data item is the type of information the field is designed or meant to contain and the identifier is the category". This interpretation is quite difficult to understand because: in paragraph 0036 Champagne recites that the category of the field defines a type of information the field is designed or meant to contain and if the formed data item is the type of information then the formed data item is the category, but according to the Patent Office's interpretation, the identifier is the category and, therefore, according to the Patent Office's interpretation the formed data item is the identifier. As recited in the independent claims, the formed data item is a different object than the grouping identifier; that is, the formed data item is not a type of information but the data item is the information itself, see, e.g. page 7, lines 18-30 of the present application.

The Patent Office on page 5 in the Office Action refers to the last four lines of paragraph

9

0036 of Champagne. The Patent Office appears to be treating "a list of field categories" as an object rather than "a grouping identifier" that groups data items in the solution of the present application. Champagne does not teach that the list of field categories is an object that defines if data in a certain field belongs to a certain group or not. In the light of the last four lines of paragraph 0036 of Champagne, a more probable interpretation is such that there is first a selected group of databases (or a set of databases designed to conform a field identification protocol) and then the list is collected from said group (or set), i.e. a group or set is an object that defines the list but the list is not an object that is used for defining the group or set.

Champagne teaches that the list is provided by a field identification protocol that provides syntax for identifying and communicating characteristics of a data field of a database. Champagne does not teach that data in the data field is associated with said list as a response to forming said data.

The Patent Office rejected claims 9-11 and 21 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Alam, in view of Champagne, and further in view of Hunkins, U.S. Patent No. 6,141,663.

Claims 9-11 and 21 are allowable at least for the reasons that claims 1-10, 12-20, and 22 are allowable.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-22 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-22 is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/645,687
Art Unit: 2165

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski   _August 17, 2006_
Walter J. Malinowski   Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400, extension 19

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

_8/17/2006_   _Elaine F. Mann_
Date   Name of Person Making Deposit

11